

## **Patterns of Social Relationships and Their Outcomes: The Case of Ireland**

This study investigates patterns of relationships in Ireland, focusing on the impact of such relationships within Irish society. This paper contends that the social climate in modern and present-day Ireland may be traced to the historical context. Thus, patterns of relationships appear in various periods, and the current relational patterns result from historical events and the social structure of pre-modern Ireland. More specifically, hegemonic relations have been present throughout history. As a result, the Irish have endured unequal treatment, as they have been viewed as inferior, and forced to suffer due to poor economic and social conditions.<sup>1</sup> Further, issues of inequality, dominance, and conflict have been evident in Ireland for centuries.

The present study examines four time periods: a) the historical context, part one, to Cromwell, b) the historical context, part two through the Battle of the Boyne, c) the Battle of the Diamond and the formation of the Orange Order through 1920, and d) modern and contemporary Ireland. Although these periods may seem arbitrary, they represent distinct yet interrelated historical eras. Thus, the historical contexts provide a detailed description of pre-modern Ireland through the Battle of the Boyne. Further, because these periods span multiple centuries and provide the foundation for our conclusions, the presentation of the findings for this period is the most extended and in-depth. Period three begins with the Battle of the Diamond and the formation of the Orange Order and ends with the transition to establish the Irish Republic. Period four focuses on modern and contemporary Ireland to the present.

This study contributes to the sociological literature as it uses a social psychological perspective to investigate group behavior and the structural conditions present in Ireland. Hence, what are the social outcomes produced by inter-group relations in Ireland? To answer this question, this paper employs a theory focusing on patterns of relationships, providing a unique insight into the complexities of social structure and conflict. Moreover, analyzing

four specific periods reveals how the patterns have in the past and continue to affect Irish society. Finally, this paper suggests that patterns of relationships, social structure, and various social practices produce certain outcomes for individuals, communities, and society.

### *Elementary Theory*

This paper employs elementary theory to better understand the patterns of social relationships in Ireland. According to Willer, “at the core of Elementary Theory is a ‘modeling procedure’ that is used to build models for properties inside the actor, like preferences and beliefs, and for properties outside the actor, like social relations and social structures.”<sup>2</sup> Further, “these are theoretic models for actors in relations in structures, and they begin with simple elements, ‘sanctions’ that are connected to generate preferences, beliefs, and relations.”<sup>3</sup>

The theory focuses on social relations present in every society.<sup>4</sup> These relations include: a) coercion, b) conflict, and c) exchange. Regarding coercion, the actor possesses the ability to impose a sanction on another actor (known as the coercee). If the coercee does not respond positively, the coercer may threaten the coercee with a negative sanction.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the desired behavior eliminates the need to apply a negative sanction. The second relation involves conflict. While positive and negative responses are characteristic of conflict, the relation represents a different form as “in conflict, because the two transactions are negative, neither actor benefits when the sanction of the other is transmitted.”<sup>6</sup> As a result, agreements arise when either party administers no sanctions.<sup>7</sup> However, “when an agreement is not attained [between actors], the relationship is in confrontation, and both actors transmit their negatives.”<sup>8</sup> Exchange represents a mutually beneficial relationship. When both actors benefit in a particular situation, an exchange relationship may develop. Further, exchange also involves the development of an agreement between actors.<sup>9</sup>

This paper suggests that the historical context demonstrates evidence of social relationships (primarily coercion and conflict), and this context provides the foundation for analyzing social relations in modern and contemporary Ireland. Further, it contends that the social relations produce essential outcomes for society.

### *Methods and Analysis*

This paper utilizes the historical/comparative method, theoretical analysis, and content analysis to analyze patterns of relationships and the outcomes of such relations. Historical/comparative analysis may be defined as “the examination of societies over time and in comparison with one another.”<sup>10</sup> Overlapping somewhat with content analysis and other field methodologies, historical/comparative analysis involves the use of historical methods by sociologists.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, content analysis consists of the study of communication. As Adler and Clark suggest, content analysis is a “technique that is particularly useful for doing historical investigations.”<sup>12</sup> Further, content analysis is a method of data collection in which some form of communication is studied and analyzed systematically.<sup>13</sup>

To conduct the historical/comparative study and theoretical analysis, both archival (primary sources) and secondary sources were used. Qualitative content analysis is employed to examine these documents, allowing us to identify themes in the documents related to coercion, conflict, and exchange. This methodology helps examine processes for the purpose of comparing this culture over time. Further, qualitative content analysis is designed for verbal analysis.<sup>14</sup> This methodology allows researchers to read and reread each document, paper, book, article, etc., to detect various themes related to our study while avoiding oversights.

### *Historical Context, Part One*

The themes of coercion and conflict (coercion, in particular) are evident in the historical context. The struggle for power by the minority group and the successful maintenance of power and dominance by Britain provides numerous examples of a coercive relationship and the development and perpetuation of intergroup conflict. Conflictual social relations in Ireland are deeply rooted in her bitter history with England that dates back to the Anglo-Norman invasion of 1169. Ireland was in the midst of civil war and the King of Leinster, Diarmait MacMurchada, fled to England to ask for aid from Strongbow, the earl of Pembroke, in fending off other Irish kings. Strongbow agreed to assist, and not only did he return MacMurchada to the throne, but he paved the way for King Henry II in 1171 to establish his supremacy over Ireland and the Norman lords who had subsequently established themselves in the land and later formed the three great earldoms of Ormond, Desmond, and Kildare.<sup>15</sup> As historian Piers Brendon notes, Ireland became England's "first real colony" from this point forward, and although "invaded by Henry II," it was "subjugated by Henry VIII, 'settled' by Elizabeth, 'planted' by James I, ravaged by Cromwell and crushed by William of Orange."<sup>16</sup> The policies pursued by each of these monarchs in the Irish context resulted ultimately in what historians Newton Key and Robert Bucholz have called a "pattern for future tragedies" that include "religious friction, mistrust, misunderstanding, violence, rebellion, revenge, and English military occupation."<sup>17</sup>

In the three centuries between Henry II and Henry VIII, a "fragile but viable balance" existed between the English monarchy and her Irish colony primarily due to the ruling autonomy of the Old English in a "hybrid" society of both English and Gaelic ways.<sup>18</sup> Under the guidance of Henry VIII's chief minister, Thomas Cromwell, this balance was ultimately destroyed as the English monarchy sought to subjugate its Irish colony and "anglicize" it. One of the main catalysts for a new Irish policy was the rebellion of the Fitzgeralds of

Kildare, the predominant ruling Old English dynasty in Ireland, who were staunchly Catholic. The proximity of a Catholic Ireland to England was not lost on Henry as he instituted the Reformation and broke from Rome. In an attempt to prevent the Reformation in Ireland, Thomas Fitzgerald, Lord Offaly, son of the ninth earl of Kildare, rebelled against Henry, declaring

I am none of Henrie his Deputie; I am his fo. I have more mind to conquer than to governe—to meet him in the field than to serve him in office. . . and will choose rather to die with valiantnesse and libertie, than to live under King Henrie in bondage and villanie.<sup>19</sup>

He subsequently offered Ireland to Pope Paul III and Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. Henry was able to put down the rebellion, and he later executed the earl.<sup>20</sup> In 1536, an Act of Supremacy for Ireland was passed, which stated that “the King our Sovereign Lord . . . of this said land of Ireland, shall be accepted, taken, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the whole Church of Ireland.”<sup>21</sup> The following year, Ireland was subjected to the same vein of Reformation legislation as England, including the dissolution of the monasteries, the destruction of relics, and the establishment of an English liturgy.<sup>22</sup> Ireland was now at the forefront of Tudor politics, and the new policy towards Ireland was part of a more significant attempt to consolidate the Crown’s monarchical authority within his peripheral realms.<sup>23</sup> The program was cultural, legal, and structural. The objective was to anglicize the Irish by coercion and, if that failed, to use violent suppression while demanding complete obedience and loyalty to the English Crown.

To further the policy of cultural Anglicization, in 1537, *An Act of the English Order, Habit, and Language* was passed concerning Ireland. The law demanded that the “English tongue, habit, and order, may be henceforth continually . . . used by all men that will acknowledge themselves . . . to be his Highness’s true and faithful subjects . . . inhabiting this land of Ireland.” The law forbade traditional Irish dress and commanded the people to adopt the English language and to “use and keep their houses and households, as near as ever they

can, according to English order, condition, and manner.”<sup>24</sup> Irish submission to the English was cloaked in the notion of “civility.” In a letter promising submission, Gaelic lord MacWilliam Burke argued that he and his ancestors had been “brought up in a rude country, without order or good civility.”<sup>25</sup> “Civility,” it was believed, was a trait that could be achieved through assimilation and the adoption of English ways. Along with adoption came the discontinuation of traditional Irish ways, which according to the law, must be abandoned entirely.

More important than simply adopting English ways, submission was the true path to Anglicization. Four years later, Henry VIII dropped the title Lord of Ireland and legally established that “the king’s highness, his heirs and successors, kings of England be always king of this land of Ireland.”<sup>26</sup> Both the Old English and Gaelic septs (Irish chiefs) found themselves increasingly in a position in which their power was threatened and infringed upon by the growing authority of the Crown in Ireland. Henry instituted “surrender-and-regrant,” and both the Gaelic septs and Old English lords were required to surrender their ancestral claims to their lands and titles in exchange for those bestowed upon them by Henry himself. Once the titles and lands were surrendered, the lords would “receive and hold his lands from the King, and take such a title as the King shall give him.”<sup>27</sup> At the end of Henry’s reign, Ireland was in a state of unrest due to this policy. He eventually, under the guidance of his minister Edward Seymour, 1st Duke of Somerset, abandoned in favor of enlarging the military garrison stationed on the island. With Henry’s death in 1547, Ireland remained “unsettled,” and one could argue, “unanglicized.”

Henry’s attempts at Anglicization influenced his daughter and heir, Elizabeth I. Her Irish program resulted ultimately in “an era of almost uninterrupted turmoil,” and by the end of the sixteenth century, “the institutions of the Gaelic world would be in ruin, the semiautonomous earldoms would have vanished, and the whole society of the island would

be radically altered.”<sup>28</sup> During her reign, Elizabeth continued the policies of Anglicization but through a new mechanism: colonization via the plantation model. The failure of the Reformation to take hold in Ireland was a significant concern for the Protestant Queen. Under her reign, England would make the painful transition from a Protestant nation to a nation of Protestants. Catholic Ireland’s reluctance to convert and submit to Protestantism could not be ignored in light of the English war with Catholic Spain. Whereas Henry had begun the process of both Anglicization and Reformation, Elizabeth aimed to complete it.

While Elizabeth dabbled with implementing policies like that of her father, such as surrender-and-regrant and other ordinances outlawing Irish traditional dress and customs, her true legacy in Ireland is that of colonization and plantations.<sup>29</sup> In the early 1570s, plantations were established in both Down and Antrim and Munster by 1584. Where plantations were not established, the English continued to engage in colonialism by instituting English shires, customs, and laws. As historian R.F. Foster has noted, it is difficult to determine if Elizabeth’s plantation scheme was that of Anglicization or colonization. According to Foster, “‘Anglicization’ presupposed a slow process” that called for “destabilizing Gaelic society . . . by introducing English modes of law, tenure, and social relations,” whereas colonization “amount[ed] at least in theory to tearing Gaelicism out by the roots.”<sup>30</sup> In 1563, Elizabeth entertained a “proposal to plant 4,000 English in Northern Ireland.”<sup>31</sup> Although the idea of plantations in Ireland was not new, Sir Thomas Sidney, one of the English Lord Deputies of Ireland, proposed that via colonization Elizabeth could quell rebellions in Ireland by appropriating the land of agitating Irish septs and then parceling it out to those who demonstrated loyalty and the rest would be set aside for English gentlemen who would then settle with their families. Initially, Sidney recommended to Elizabeth’s principal advisor, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, that colonization could occur without government cost if “persuasion wolde be used emonges the nobilitie, and principal gentlemen of England, that

there might ... be induced here some Collany.”<sup>32</sup> Indeed, numerous gentlemen were willing to go “plant” Ireland, and Elizabeth and her advisors received Ireland.<sup>33</sup> However, despite Sidney’s plan to quell rebellions, the additional encroachment by new English settlers only resulted in further rebellion and violence from the Gaelic Irish and the Old English, who also resented the new settlers. Ireland consistently erupted in rebellions throughout the localities from the 1560s until the last major insurrection of Elizabeth’s reign in 1594 in Ulster.

The continual violence and insurrection led many English settlers to view themselves as liberators and agents of civilization.<sup>34</sup> Poet Edmund Spenser asserted that the English should work “to bring [the Irish] from their delight of licensious barbarisme unto the love of goodnesse and civility.”<sup>35</sup> It is important to note that the process of Anglicization did not necessarily mean that one would become English. Ireland would look English with its shires, urban centers, government structure, Protestant religion, and perhaps even in dress and mannerism. Yet, this did not mean that the “natives” of Ireland would ever be accepted as Englishmen. The plantation system was developed in such a manner that English purity would be preserved among the English settlers, protecting them from native Irish influence. In “An Abstract of the Articles for repeopling and inhabiting the Province of Munster in Ireland,” Elizabeth outlined both the physical and cultural perimeters of the Munster plantation. The English settlers were forbidden from selling or passing their land to the “mere” or pure Irish. Further, Elizabeth ordered that the settlers should “be planted together as near as may be” to avoid “intermixture” of the English and Irish, and the “heads of every family shall be born of English parents, and the heirs female inheritable . . . shall marry with none but with persons born of English parents, or with such as descend of the first patentees.” Elizabeth dictated that “no mere Irish to be permitted in any family there.”<sup>36</sup> Although the English would inhabit and assume responsibility for the land, the labor pool would remain primarily native Irish.



Historian Theodore Allen argues that “the plantation concept was a negation of surrender-and-regrant” as that system had utilized “Irish chieftans as the social buffer; ‘plantation’ was based on their degradation and exclusion.”<sup>37</sup> For Allen, the Irish plantation model was the precursor to that of the New World, and the attitudes the English demonstrated towards the Irish are analogous to their later attitudes towards Native Americans and enslaved Africans. For example, in 1581, Andrew Trollope, an English lawyer, wrote to Lord Walsingham and described the Irish men, “except in the walled towns, are not Christian, civil or human creatures, but heathen or rather savages and brute beasts.”<sup>38</sup> For the English, the Irish were not of the same race, and the plantation system that was developed under Elizabeth, and would be perfected by James I, was as devoted to preserving racial English purity as it was to bringing civilization and perpetuating Anglicization.<sup>39</sup>

For Elizabeth, disseminating the Protestant faith was as important as preserving racial purity through the plantation system. Both the Irish and the Old English remained Catholic and resistant to Protestant theology. Although the Irish Parliament had passed essentially the same Reformation laws as England under the reign of Henry VIII, these laws had been repealed upon the ascension of his Catholic daughter Mary to the throne in 1553. Therefore, in 1560, new legislation was passed that “restored” the supremacy of Elizabeth over the church. The same year, an Act of Uniformity was also passed, which instituted the use of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, liturgy, and the administration of the sacraments.<sup>40</sup> Despite this legislation, the Irish and Old English still clung to their Catholicism, and therefore Ireland became a central point of struggle for England and her primary Catholic rival, Spain. Six years later, Cecil asserted to Sidney that the “people [in Ireland] desire in a change in religion.”<sup>41</sup> In 1579, the Privy Council instructed that the Irish were “to be trained in true religion and godliness.”<sup>42</sup>

Despite English efforts, the Protestant religion made little headway in Ireland due to the lack of a Gaelic New Testament translation or a body of Protestant ministers willing to go to the island.<sup>43</sup> In 1586, Robert Rosyer, Attorney General of Munster, asserted that “all the country born people are most superstitious in religion to the advancement of vice and subversion of virtue . . . It is impossible for them to be good subjects to Her Majesty who are so inwardly bent unto the Pope.”<sup>44</sup> Sir Thomas Norreys, vice-president of Munster plantation, argued that the Irish were “most obstinate contrariety in religion” and due to their “inward affection that they have always borne to the Spaniard . . . I do think it somewhat dangerous that too much trust be reposed in them.”<sup>45</sup> Although the “planting” of English settlers had thus far failed to bring “civility” or the supremacy of the Protestant religion, many of Elizabeth’s government still believed that the plantation could work. Sir William Herbert, in a series of tracts written on the Irish realm, contended that “gentlemen of good ability and disposition out of England, that by their good example, direction, and industry, both true religion, sincere justice, and perfect civility might be here planted” could exert a positive influence over the “undisciplined people inhabitants so much differing in manners, language, and country from them.”<sup>46</sup> The continued belief was that if an area “might have been inhabited with Englishmen according to good meaning, it would have furthered religion” and subsequently “greatly furthered the common wealth both of England and Ireland.”<sup>47</sup>

In 1594, the English fear that the Catholic Irish would turn to the Spanish came to fruition when the most powerful Irish sept leader of Ulster, Hugh O’Neill, earl of Tyrone, decided to instigate a war with England by attacking Enniskillen and Blackwater Fort. Elizabeth issued a royal proclamation against the “Great O’Neill” and declared “to all her good subjects, both English and Irish, the said Earl to be accepted the principal traitor . . . and a known practiser with Spain and other her Majesty’s enemies.”<sup>48</sup> Tyrone, along with another

sept leader Hugh O'Donnell, wrote to the King of Spain, pleading that "re-establishing the Catholic religion rests on your assistance ...we hope to restore the faith of the Church, and to secure you a kingdom."<sup>49</sup> Although Tyrone hoped to induce the Catholic Old English into rebellion, they were skeptical and remained at arms-length. The Spanish tried to aid Tyrone on three separate occasions, but as in the Spanish Armada in 1588, the "Protestant Wind" held them at bay. Finally, in September 1595, the Crown drew up a list of conditions that would be placed on any peace negotiated with Tyrone, which included provisions that would have allowed him to remain in possession of land and continue to rule his own family. Still, it would be required that "he shall deliver ...all such Jesuits or seminary priests...that have repaired unto him in this time of rebellion."<sup>50</sup>

After a series of victories, Tyrone issued his series of demands. The first several pertained to the Catholic religion and asserted that the "catholic, apostolic, and Roman religion be openly preached...throughout all Ireland" and "that the Church of Ireland be wholly governed by the pope." Further, Tyrone pressed for self-government, stating that "all principal governments of Ireland ...be governed by Irish noblemen." Elizabeth's advisor, Sir Robert Cecil, noted in the margins a single word: "Ewtopia."<sup>51</sup> Elizabeth appointed one of her favorites, the earl of Essex, as "her General" and outfitted him with a "good army of 12,000 or 14,000 foot and 1,000 horse." Her advisors contended, "with which force, and which Commander, I doubt not but that Kingdom shall be reduced to better terms."<sup>52</sup> The war was not a quick victory despite England's vast resources and would drag on until 1603. Essex ultimately bungled his command and "was without any return to her Majesty's favour" and was replaced with Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, who in the end was able to put down the rebellion and end the war."<sup>53</sup> On March 24, 1603, Elizabeth died. Six days later, Tyrone surrendered and made a "penitent submission to her Majesty," only to learn of her death.<sup>54</sup>

The war represented a clash between two visions of what Ireland should be: Irish or English. Tyrone's "utopia" was of an Ireland that was Catholic and ruled by Irish noblemen who were free to move, travel, learn, and trade with the same rights and privileges as Englishmen.<sup>55</sup> This Ireland left little room for the English in how they were accustomed to operating. The *Calendar State Papers of Ireland* throughout the reign of Elizabeth are littered with comments regarding the cost of maintaining the plantations and the garrisons in Ireland. After such a hefty investment, the English were unlikely to vacate their colonies. Furthermore, as long as Ireland remained Catholic, the Crown saw its presence in Ireland as a matter of national security due to the Spanish Crown's interest in an island with such proximity to England.

Historians estimate that as much as £2 million was spent on the Nine Years' War and that at least 60,000 Irish lost their lives.<sup>56</sup> The English were vicious in the final years of the war, often reporting that they had "burnt and spoiled all the country thereabouts...eating, burning, and spoiling, killing and destroying all that could be found in the country." In their war against the Irish "rebels," the English soldiers "kill[ed] man, woman, child, horse, beast, and whatsoever we found." They "spare none of what quality or sex soever, and it hath bred much terror in the people."<sup>57</sup> Edmund Spenser had advised this tactic in his *A Briefe Note of Ireland*, in which he argued that the Irish had a natural hatred for the English due to the conquest of Henry II, and the plantation system could only fail in this instance. Due to this hatred, rebellion was natural unless "extending vpon them the terror of your wrath in avengement of there continuall disloyalltie and disobedience you shall spreade the honorable fame of your Iustice and redeeme both your owne honour." Spenser insisted that "Great force must be the instrument, but famine must be the meane for till Ireland be famished it can not be subdued."<sup>58</sup> The length and bloody nature of the war with Ireland would only further sow seeds of mistrust between the Irish and the English. The interactions between the two

peoples would not become less conflictual; to some extent, Elizabeth's reign demonstrated a pattern that would continue throughout the early modern period. English rulers would try to coerce their Irish colonists into "civilization" for periods, but in the end, this coercion almost always devolved into bloody conflict as the Irish did not bend to the English will.

Elizabeth's nephew and heir, James I of England and VI of Scotland, intended to capitalize on this terror and fully colonize Ulster via the plantation system in the way that Elizabeth and her government never accomplished. James's goal in Ireland was not new or unique. He sought to bring "civilization" in the same manner as Henry VIII or Elizabeth, and he continued to build upon the legacy left by his predecessors in his endeavors. The reality that a Catholic Ireland was a real threat had not changed, and in the early years of James's reign, his government began to discuss the "plantation of English and Scots" in Ulster.<sup>59</sup> R.F. Foster notes that "accidents intervened to delay the offensive," but James intended to pursue a rigorous "civilizing enterprise" in Ireland, which became significantly more manageable once the great Irish earls fled Ireland for the continent.<sup>60</sup> Sir John Davies, Attorney General for Ireland, wrote that in the absence of the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, "His Majesty's happy government will work a greater miracle in this Kingdom than ever St. Patrick did, for St. Patrick only banished the poisonous worms, but suffered the men full of poison to inhabit the land still; but His Majesty's blessed genius will banish all those generations of vipers out of it, and make it...a right fortunate island."<sup>61</sup> As historian Raymond Gillespie explained, while the plantation system of Elizabeth influenced James, his scheme in Ulster was "unlike most early seventeenth-century plantations" as it was a "sophisticated affair, involving not just a reassignment of lands but also a restructuring of the social order."<sup>62</sup> Sir Francis Bacon argued that the "King's work in chief" was to rescue Ireland "from desolation and a desert (in many parts) to population and plantation; and from savage and barbarous customs to humanity and civility."<sup>63</sup>

The goal was to build a “civil” plantation that was orderly; therefore, the settlement was planned in a highly efficient manner. Lands were stripped of “rebels,” and allotments would be available in plots of 1,000 to 2,000 acres and were to be divided up and allocated to three specific groups of settlers.<sup>64</sup> Those Irishmen who had demonstrated their loyalty to the Crown during the previous rebellion were allotted land as freemen. James provided for two other groups in his “Scheme of Plantation,” and these two groups would receive the majority of the available land. One such group was the English and Scottish settlers and servitors, or men who had served the Crown in a civil or military capacity. The English and Scottish settlers/servitors were expected “to plant their proportions with English or inland Scottish inhabitants.” The Englishmen who had previously settled and were loyal were noted as “servitors in the Kingdom of Ireland” and were allowed to “take ‘mere’ Irish, English, or inland Scottish tenants at their choice.” The English and Scots who chose to settle in Ulster were required to take the Oath of Supremacy and to “conform themselves in religion according to his Majesty’s laws.”

Further, they were forbidden from allowing native Irish tenants who “will not take the Oath.”<sup>65</sup> The settlers were required to build castles and buildings and to till the soil “after the English manner.”<sup>66</sup> The Irish who were granted land did this and adopted English law, customs, and mannerisms to demonstrate their loyalty to the Crown.

While James’s plans were highly efficient rather than the piecemeal attempt by previous monarchs, it was not an immediate success. His scheme relied heavily on the immigration of English and Scottish settlers, which proved challenging to find in the large numbers required to carry out the plantations to their full extent. Historians estimate that between 1610 and 1630, around 24,000 new British migrants arrived in Ulster, and once the settlers arrived, retention also proved problematic.<sup>67</sup> In some instances, undertakers who had promised to use fellow Englishmen or Scotsmen as tenants were forced to rely on the native

Irish in breach of their contracts. James and his ministers were often displeased by the continued use of Irish natives. Still, the reality of a lack of English and Scottish settlers in sufficient numbers to serve as tenants kept them from punishing the landowners.<sup>68</sup>

Despite the large influx of Protestant, and more specifically Presbyterian, settlers, Ulster remained religiously divided, and those who adhered to the Protestant faith were in the majority in the region, but this was primarily due to the waves of immigration rather than conversion of the native Irish.<sup>69</sup> The prevalence of Catholicism that remained in Ireland, despite the process of colonization and Anglicization that had occurred over the past decades, was not viewed in the same light by James I, or even his son, Charles, as it had been by Elizabeth. Neither James nor Charles wished to harm their diplomatic relations over the issue of religion. In fact, for a period, James's favorite, the Duke of Buckingham, was in negotiations with Spain for a possible marriage between Charles and the Spanish Infanta. In light of these pressing international negotiations and relationships, penal laws against Catholics were not always evenly enforced in Ireland. In exchange, the Catholic Irish landowners often helped to fill the royal coffers. As Northern Ireland began to look more and more English over time as the native Irish continued to be inundated and influenced by English culture, one of the last distinguishing features between the societies of the immigrant settlers and the native Irish was that of religion.

Whereas Ireland had been at the forefront of Tudor policy, she fell into the background to a certain extent under the early Stuarts as domestic issues dominated the English political landscape. The Irish plantation system continued under James's son and heir, Charles I. Charles appointed Sir Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, as his Lord Deputy in Ireland. Charles struggled to rule his three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland as he tried to impose a uniform religion and was in open conflict with the English Parliament over the issue of government administration and finance. On the surface, it would

seem that the Irish Catholics would have been amenable to Charles's attempts to re-introduce ceremony and Catholic-esque attributes into the Church of England. However, the native Irish had suffered for several decades under the arrogant encroachment of the English and Scottish settlers. As Charles tried to raise money for a potential war with Spain and a brewing war with the Scottish, he tried via Strafford to extort money from all echelons of society in Ireland, making Charles a common enemy for both the settlers and native Irish.

A year before the English Civil War, in which Charles would raise his standard at Nottingham against the Parliamentary Army, open rebellion erupted in Ireland. The uprising began on October 22, 1641, when Sir Phelim O'Neill and his followers captured Charlemont Fort. Thomas Bartlett argues that the initial rebellion was an attempt to demonstrate the strength of the native Irish who had been loyal since the beginning of the century and perhaps, entice Charles to negotiate with them, if not use them as allies in his war with the Scottish.<sup>70</sup> Yet, none of this came into fruition as the rebellion trickled down to the masses, and Ireland exploded into the "first popular uprising" that would continue for over twenty years. Rumors abounded that "The Papists had made a conspiracy all to rise . . . to cut the throats of all the Protestants in Ireland."<sup>71</sup> Spectators in England argued that in Ireland, "more barbarous and inhuman actions are practiced towards our brethren by nation and religion," and they feared that "the very great name of the English and the Protestant will be rooted out."<sup>72</sup> By late 1641, it was clear that only an army could put down the rebellion, but Charles and his Parliament were at an impasse, and neither trusted the other to lead such an army. Parliament was especially concerned that Charles might lead an army in Ireland as they suspected him of having Catholic "sympathies."

This rebellion, in many ways, continued a pattern established by both Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. Through various legal and cultural mechanisms, the English sought to subdue, reform, and subjugate the Irish populations. English policy often centered on coercing the



Irish natives by promising land and wealth in exchange for loyalty. Attached to the promise of land and economic opportunities were also expectations of Anglicization and conversion to Protestantism. Although over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Ireland increasingly physically looked like England, the native Irish clung to their religion as the last bastion of their native culture. The rebellion also demonstrated to what extent the English had not accepted the Irish. The English did not consider their Irish colony to be composed of fellow Englishmen but continued to view the native Catholic Irish as uncivilized and barbarian. Inevitably, over a period of time, the Irish would rebel as theoretical promises did not correspond with the complex realities of life under the English. Until 1641, the rebellions tended to be localized in specific areas, which did not, as in the case of the Nine Years' War, mean that they were necessarily easy to defeat, but this particular rebellion was not localized to Ulster as it extended throughout the island.

### *Historical Context, Part Two*

As King and Parliament became embroiled in a civil war that would determine the future of England's political structure, the Ireland rebellion was not viewed from the English perspective as a priority. This changed to an extent after the trial and execution of Charles I on January 30, 1649. Oliver Cromwell, commander of the Parliamentary New Model Army, turned his attention to Ireland, and his actions are more often than not "identified with massacre and expropriation."<sup>73</sup> As much as he was intent on creating a "godly" society in England, Cromwell also intended to punish the Irish for taking up arms against the English and their alleged attacks upon the Protestants throughout the rebellion.

Cromwell landed just north of Dublin and proceeded to reconquer the island, town by town. In 1649, he presented an account of his conquest of Drogheda to the House of Commons, which is generally believed to describe the method by which he proceeded throughout the island. Upon arriving in Drogheda, he "sent Arthur Ashton, the then

Governor, a summons to deliver the town to the use of the Parliament of England.” When he “received no satisfactory answer,” Cromwell then “proceeded...to beat down the steeple of the church.” His army then slaughtered 2,000 men, and the townspeople fled, hid in St. Peter’s church, and refused to surrender. Cromwell then ordered the church “to be fired.” Throughout the account, Cromwell always justifies his brutality with the defense that he extended the Irish an opportunity to surrender. When the Irish did not comply, he did not hesitate to kill them. He argued, “I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood.” He believed that his brutality would serve as a warning and perhaps that “it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future.”<sup>74</sup>

The English war with the Irish officially ended in 1652 with the English *Act for the Settlement of Ireland*, which stated that “all estates declared by” Catholics and Irish natives who had participated in the rebellion against England were “to be forfeited,” while it did not “extend to make void estates of any English Protestants, who have constantly adhered to the Parliament.”<sup>75</sup> The plantation model that Elizabeth and James had established was continued during the Interregnum, but in this instance, Ireland was not planted with civilian settlers but rather with soldiers. Further, the native Irish and their lords were removed to exile in Connaught. Vincent Gookin, an advisor of Cromwell, did not fully advocate for the indiscriminate expulsion of native Irish as he argued that “the Irish numbers (now so abated by Famine, Pestilence, the Sword, and Foreign Transportations are not like to overgrow the English as formerly, and so no fear of their being obnoxious to them hereafter...they are likely to be swallowed up by the English, and incorporated into them.”<sup>76</sup> Many felt that this was necessary for the utmost safety of the English settlers, as accounts of the rebellion spoke of horrors that were not unlike those carried out by the English on the Irish during the Nine Years’ War. According to Richard Lawrence, “when the bloody Rebels in 1641 committed

that inhumane Massacre...wherein neither Age nor Sex were spared...and not onely English people but English cattle and Houses were destroyed.”<sup>77</sup> What was once used by the English as a tool of submission and subjugation became barbaric and inhumane in the hands of the Irish. With the land policies of 1652, Cromwell ensured that his Irish legacy would be that most landholders were Protestant rather than Catholic. According to Theodore Allen, “about five out of every eight acres of profitable land” were owned by Catholics in 1641, but by 1654, “that share was reduced to one out of twelve.”<sup>78</sup>

Upon the Restoration, Charles II largely left Cromwellian policy regarding land in place, although he was far more religiously tolerant than his predecessors. His willingness to extend toleration had left many hoping he would reverse the land policy, but they would only be disappointed. During the reigns of Charles II and his successor James II, Ireland was pushed even further to the back burner as a priority as English domestic issues of Restoration and settlement took the forefront. Charles II was primarily occupied with consolidating his monarchical authority over that of Parliament. Upon Charles’s death in 1685, his Catholic brother, James II, assumed the throne and began a four-year battle with Parliament. England’s Parliament did not trust James, and they increasingly grew concerned as he used Catholic advisors and appointed Catholics as officers in his army.

In 1688, a bipartisan group of Whigs and Tories invited the Protestant William of Orange to rule England, and he invaded on November 5, 1688. James fled England in December. By March, he arrived in Ireland, hoping to raise a Catholic army. Whereas the English Parliament had passed a bill claiming that James had abdicated the throne, the Irish Parliament asserted that “his majesty’s realm of Ireland is, and hath been always a distinct kingdom from that of his majesty’s realm of England, always governed by his majesty and his predecessors, according to the ancient customs, laws, and statutes.”<sup>79</sup> With the support of James, the Irish Parliament passed a bill extending religious toleration within Ireland to both

Protestants and Catholics. This act, after more than a century of religious persecution, made James immensely popular, and he began to raise an army that he hoped would be a force that could restore him to his throne. However, in 1690, William defeated James at the Battle of the Boyne, creating a Protestant ascendancy. Thus, “The Old English and the native Irish had little or no hope of regaining land or influence, and for more than a century, they suffered grievously from penal measures designed to buttress the colonists’ grip on Ireland.”<sup>80</sup> At the same time, Protestant polarization emerged with Unionists striving for political power, and “as a result, a Protestant state emerged, and alienation and disaffection of Nationalists became a standard practice. This practice of alienation continued well into the twentieth century.”<sup>81</sup>

#### *The Battle of the Diamond and the Formation of the Orange Order Through 1920*

Evidence of coercion, conflict, and exchange is apparent during the third period. However, conflict represents the dominant relation beginning with the clash of Protestants and Catholics in County Armagh at the Battle of the Diamond in 1785, which represented the start of a series of sectarian disturbances in the area.<sup>82</sup> Following the Battle of the Diamond, the Orange Order was formed to produce strengthened social solidarity for Protestants and demonstrate loyalty to the Crown and Protestantism. As Edwards contends, “during a time of significant sectarian conflict in the eighteenth century, the Orange Order emerged as a group dedicated to the protection of Protestants who had just defeated Catholics at the Battle of the Diamond.”<sup>83</sup> It should be noted that there has been some examination regarding the significance of religion within the Orange Order organization. While religion may appear to be a symbolic marker as opposed to a significant practice within the Orange institution, there is evidence to suggest that because the Orange Order identifies as a religious organization, sociologists may consider it a religious movement.<sup>84</sup> That is to say, according to the organizational beliefs and qualifications to become a member, the Orange Order is, in fact, a

religious organization. Further, while some argue that the organization is primarily political, religion remains the critical component of the group's ideology. As Roberts argues, "if here the simple maintenance of religion appears to play a subsidiary part to the political aims, these political aims rest upon the Protestant religious settlement."<sup>85</sup>

Conflict was an ongoing theme between Unionists and Nationalists throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century. Theobald Wolfe Tone, James Napper Tandy, and Thomas Russell created The United Irishmen. As Curtin asserts, this group became a vital unifier for various disadvantaged groups seeking emancipation from Britain.<sup>86</sup> This included a loose relationship with the Defenders. This movement ultimately dissolved due to internal problems and repression by the government.<sup>87</sup> Toward the end of the eighteenth century, the Volunteer Movement began to develop, headed by individuals such as Henry Grattan and Charles Parnell, Protestant nationalists in favor of a united Ireland. While this movement achieved attention, historians do not consider it a particularly new idea.<sup>88</sup> The beginning of the nineteenth century marked the emergence of another movement to challenge Protestant dominance. Speeches were delivered and resolutions constructed to produce political change in Ireland. In one resolution, demands were made regarding the creation of the Irish parliament, providing certain rights and privileges to the people of Ireland.

That, in claiming these rights and privileges for our country, we adopt the principle of a federal arrangement, which would secure to the Irish parliament the right of legislating for and regulating all matters relating to the internal affairs of Ireland, while leaving to the imperial parliament the power of dealing with all questions affecting the imperial crown and government, legislation regarding the colonies and other dependencies of the crown, the relationship of the empire with foreign states, and all matters appertaining to the defence and stability of the empire at large, as well as the power of granting the supplies necessary for imperial purposes.<sup>89</sup>

Moreover, W.E. Gladstone delivered the First Home Rule Bill Speech, stating: "We stand face to face with what is termed Irish nationality...I ask that in our own case we should

practice with firm and fearless hand, what we have so often preached...namely, that the concession of local self-government is not the way to sap or impair, but the way to strengthen and consolidate unity.”<sup>90</sup>

While Nationalists demonstrated a strong desire for self-governance, Protestants feared their way of life would be endangered by home rule.<sup>91</sup> That is, Nationalists and Feinians desired complete independence from Britain, and Protestant Unionists feared that they would lose power due to home rule.<sup>92</sup> Edwards notes that due to “the fears of Protestants in the north of Ireland, the anti-home rule campaign gained power. Perhaps one of the most vocal anti-home rule organizations was the Orange Order which emerged to provide leadership to the campaign to prevent the Home Rule initiative from passing.”<sup>93</sup>

During the early twentieth century, a new resolve was formed with the Easter Rising and Government of Ireland Act. The Proclamation of the Irish Republic, 1916 (read by Patrick Pearse at the Post Office in Dublin on April 24, 1916) demonstrated a determination to achieve national freedom.

In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; six times during the past three hundred years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a sovereign independent state, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades-in-arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nation.<sup>94</sup>

In 1920, the Government of Ireland Act was developed.<sup>95</sup> The creation of two states in Ireland was proposed, separating the northern region and the south. According to Edwards, “in 1920, the Government of Ireland Act was developed proposing two states in Ireland. The first state would consist of the six northeastern counties, and the second would include the remainder of Ireland.”<sup>96</sup> As Darby observed, the two sides competed over the development of the Irish state.

As to why six counties had been selected rather than four or nine or any other number, the reasons were unashamedly straightforward. They formed essentially the area which could be comfortably held with a majority in favour of the union with Britain. The traditional nine counties of Ulster held 900,000 Protestants, most of whom supported the British connection, and 700,000 Catholics, most of whom wanted to end it. However, in the six counties which were later to become Northern Ireland, the religious breakdown was 820,000 Protestants and 430,000 Catholics.<sup>97</sup>

As a result, Catholics would ultimately lose control as the result of their minority status in what would become Northern Ireland, and “the Catholic minority was deprived of political and economic power through gerrymandering and discrimination. If they turned to extra parliamentary agitation for redress, they were prevented or inhibited under sections of the Special Powers Act and later the Public Order Act. The Unionist government, by its maintenance of the Special Powers Act and by keeping the RUC as a parliamentary force, evidently expected minority to turn to violence. When they did so they were ruthlessly Suppressed.”<sup>98</sup>

### *Modern and Contemporary Ireland*

The period referred to as Modern and contemporary Ireland is characterized by significant intergroup conflict. Specifically, the decades known as “The Troubles” brought the conflictual relationship to the forefront of major world events. In a speech entitled “Ulster at the Crossroads,” Terrence O’Neill, then Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, addressed the issues:

Ulster stands at the crossroads...our conduct over the coming days will decide our future...These issues are far too serious to be determined behind closed doors or left to noisy minorities...For more than five years now I have tried to heal some of the deep divisions in our community. I did so because I could not see how an Ulster divided against itself could hope to stand.<sup>99</sup>

Between 1966 and 1982, significant changes occurred in all parts of Ireland.<sup>100</sup>

Conflict arose as challenges to hegemonic practices produced significant inequality in Northern Ireland. Unfortunately for the Catholic minority in the north, these challenges were

not immediately successful as “the Orange ideology was too deep-rooted to be defeated overnight and any suggestion or reform created Protestant backlash. Orangeism and Protestant supremacy became the reason for the heightened state, thus producing Nationalist protest, forcing the British government into a dilemma – crushing Nationalists by force alone failing, but power sharing did not seem feasible.”<sup>101</sup> Nationalists did not give up their struggle for social equality, as evident in the numerous protests organized and carried out by this community. One such protest, Bloody Sunday, provides evidence of extreme intergroup conflict. “The ‘Bloody Sunday’ event of 1972, in which thirteen people were killed in the city of Derry (also referred to as Londonderry) during what started as a peaceful protest, represents an example of resistance by the nationalist community to give up the fight for fair treatment.”<sup>102</sup>

Another major event during this time of conflict was the 1981 hunger strike at the Maze Prison. Bobby Sands (the imprisoned leader of the IRA) refused food to protest the criminalization of acts perpetrated during political conflict. Sands asserted that “there can never be peace in Ireland until the foreign, oppressive British presence is removed, leaving all the Irish people as a unit to control their own affairs and determine their own destinies as a sovereign people, free in mind, and body, and separate and distinct physically, culturally, and economically.”<sup>103</sup> Although Sands died on May 5, the hunger strike continued until October 1981, and represents a significant event during the Troubles as it “had very important and far-reaching consequences for Northern Ireland and proved to be one of the key turning points of ‘the Troubles.’”<sup>104</sup> Support for the Nationalist movement grew due to international attention and the propaganda machine utilized against the British.<sup>105</sup>

In 1998, the passage of the Good Friday Agreement provided an opportunity for peace in Northern Ireland. However, conflict remained as a portion of Unionists, particularly the Democratic Unionist Party (led by Ian Paisley) and the Orange Order, opposed the



agreement. Moreover, sectarian violence continued as Catholics and Protestants continued to be killed in various events (i.e., the killing of the Catholic boys in Balleymony in 1998, the Omagh bombing, and so forth). While an agreement was reached, conflict could not be eradicated.

Although evidence of exchange is clear, conflict relations continue to exist, and therefore, achieving genuine exchange is a challenge in Northern Ireland. While efforts in conflict resolution, reconciliation, and forgiveness are present and occasionally somewhat successful, the reality of conflict remains. Thus, for several years following the passage of the Good Friday Agreement, the parade at Drumcree was canceled by the Parades Commission, leading to organized protests by the Orange Order, and in some cases, violence erupted. For instance, residents of the Garvaghy Road (Catholics) protested the parades while the Orange Order demanded to march, thus leading to conflict and increased hostility.<sup>106</sup>

As previously stated, several programs have been and continue to be developed to bring about more exchange and promote peace between the conflicting groups. For instance, the Community Dialogue program attempts to develop understanding and build trust. Further, the Community Relations Council works to create a peaceful society. Groundwork Northern Ireland utilizes bonfire night, traditionally “an opportunity for conflict, to engage communities in cross-cultural discussions and promote cultural understanding.”<sup>107</sup>

### *Discussion and Conclusion*

Patterns of social relationships are evident in the historical context (pre-modern Ireland), modern Ireland, and contemporary Ireland. Evidence of coercion may be traced to the plantation society in Ulster, becoming more apparent as challenges to English power were attempted. Further, England’s malicious actions during the Nine Years’ War and their perpetuated dominance provided a breeding ground for conflict. Mistrust between the Irish and the English intensified, leading to increased hostility and fighting. The Battle of the

Boyne and Battle of the Diamond represent efforts by Catholics to overcome Protestant domination, thus perpetuating coercive and conflictual relationships. Protestant victories perpetuated coercion through hegemony. Following these battles, conflict increased as the opposing groups remained determined to achieve their goals.

While coercion and conflict continued through periods two and three, signs of exchange emerged. For example, the Government of Ireland Act of 1920 proposed the development of two states in Ireland.<sup>108</sup> While many opposed this arrangement, it ultimately demonstrated an exchange between conflicting groups.

Despite the development of exchange relations, the dominant social relationship during these periods was conflict. In particular, the Troubles marked a time of significant conflict between loyalists and republicans in Northern Ireland. Thus, “the 1970s and 1980s represented an unsettling time for Northern Ireland; that is, there was no peace.”<sup>109</sup> Moreover, while the signing of the Good Friday Agreement once again demonstrated signs of exchange, conflict did not disappear.

Contemporary Ireland (post Troubles) represents a society still struggling to create a relationship characterized exclusively by exchange. That is, while exchange relations exist, conflict does as well. For example, peace walls (walls erected in Belfast neighborhoods to separate Catholic and Protestant communities) provide evidence of both conflict and exchange. Whereas some community members wish to keep the walls to prevent violence, others view them as literal barriers to peace. The Peace Walls in and of themselves, therefore, represent a source of conflict. Moreover, protests over Orange Parades (e.g., Drumcree) demonstrate ongoing conflict.

As a result of the patterns of relationships, several outcomes have emerged. They include: a) power, b) strengthened collective identity, and c) maintenance of intergroup hostility. Power struggles continue to exist in Ireland. Unionists seek to maintain ties to

Britain while Nationalists strive for a united Ireland. The power struggles then contribute to a strengthened collective identity for each group. The Orange Order is perhaps one of the most significant examples of strengthened collective identity. Finally, a strong collective identity can lead to conflict, as is evident in Northern Ireland as intergroup hostility continues to exist.

Although exchange is present in Ireland today, we contend that conflict will likely remain a dominant relation. The events in pre-modern Ireland provide the foundation for a society bound by intergroup conflict. Thus, even with the population shifting toward a Catholic majority, the social disadvantages endured by this population will likely continue. Additionally, according to Coakley, the Protestant-unionist package, consisting of a national identity, communal affiliation, and constitutional preference, remains very strong.<sup>110</sup> The Catholic-nationalist package, on the other hand, is less closely related.<sup>111</sup> Others argue it cannot be assumed that a Catholic majority guarantees a vote for a United Ireland as many do not identify with nationalism. That is, identification as a Catholic does not mean the individual automatically identifies as a nationalist.<sup>112</sup> We suggest that while attempts to create exchange relationships exist within Ireland today, successful maintenance of this type of relationship will be difficult, at best. Hence, although efforts to establish peace (i.e., the Good Friday Agreement, conflict resolution programs, and so on) have worked to an extent, deep-rooted hostility remains. We conclude that due to events in the historical context, true peace and conflict resolution will not come easily.

This study contributes to research focusing on intergroup conflict, social identity, and peace studies. Using elementary theory to guide our investigation demonstrates how patterns of relationships are formed, maintained, and challenged. In addition, research focusing on minority groups, such as the Ancient Order of Hibernians, should be undertaken to understand present-day Ireland further. Further, more in-depth studies on peace efforts and barriers to peace should be considered.

## ENDNOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> David Dickson, *Old World Colony Cork and South Munster 1630-1830* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), *passim*.
- <sup>2</sup> David, Willer, "Actors in Relations," in *Network Exchange Theory*, ed. David Willer (New York: Praeger, 1999), 23.
- <sup>3</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>4</sup> Jennifer Edwards, and J. David Knotterus, "Exchange, Conflict, and Coercion: The Ritual Dynamics of the Notting Hill Carnival Past and Present," *Ethnic Studies Review* 34 (2011): 107-133.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>6</sup> Willer, "Actors in Relation," 27.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid, passim*.
- <sup>8</sup> Willer, "Actors in Relation," 27; Edwards and Knotterus, "Exchanged, Conflict, and Coercion," *passim*.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>10</sup> Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* (Belmont: Wadsworth, 2004), 332.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>12</sup> Emily Stier Adler and Roger Clark, *An Invitation to Social Research: How It's Done* (Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015), 338.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid, passim*.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>15</sup> Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics, 1588-1603* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 330.
- <sup>16</sup> Piers Brendon, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire, 1781-1997* Reprint edition (New York: Vintage, 2010), 119.
- <sup>17</sup> Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 88.
- <sup>18</sup> MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 331. Old English refers to the descendants of the original English settlers.
- <sup>19</sup> Quoted in Charles William Fitzgerald, Duke of Leinster, *The earls of Kildare, and their ancestors: from 1057-1773* (Dublin, Hodges, Smith & Co., 1864), 133.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>21</sup> *An Act authorizing the King, his Heirs, and Successors, to be Supreme Head fo the Church in Ireland* (28 Hen. VIII, c. 5) in in *Irish History from Contemporary Sources, 1509-1610* (hereafter *IHCS*), ed. Constantia Maxwell (George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1923), 122; Stephen Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603* (Longman, 1998), 207-218.
- <sup>22</sup> See Part II in *IHCS*, 121-132.
- <sup>23</sup> MacCaffrey, 334.
- <sup>24</sup> *An Act for the English Order, Habit, and Language* (28 Hen. VIII, c. 15) in *IHCS*, 112-114.
- <sup>25</sup> *MacWilliam Burke promises submission* (1541) [S.P. Hen. VIII. III, 290-91] in *IHCS*, 107.
- <sup>26</sup> *An Act that the King and His Successors be Kings of Ireland* (1541) in *Irish Historical Documents 1172-1922*, (hereafter *IHD*) ed. by Edmund Curtis and R.B. McDowell (Methuen & Co. LTD., 1943), 77.
- <sup>27</sup> *Agreements with the Ulster Chieftains* (1541) [*Cal. Carew MSS.*, I, 183-4] in *IHCS*, 110.
- <sup>28</sup> MacCaffrey, 334.
- <sup>29</sup> *Cal. Carew MSS I*, 406-11 in *IHCS*, 11, 166.
- <sup>30</sup> R.F. Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (Allen Lane: The Penguin Press, 1988), 59.

- 
- <sup>31</sup> Entry 83, (1563) in *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Ireland, of the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth* (hereafter *CSPI*), I, (1860), 228.
- <sup>32</sup> PRO SP 63/26/18 Sir Henry Sidney to William Cecil, 1566.
- <sup>33</sup> *CSPI*, I, *passim*.
- <sup>34</sup> Bucholz and Key, 147.
- <sup>35</sup> Edmund Spenser, *A Veue of the Present State of Ireland* (1596).
- <sup>36</sup> 21 June 1586, "An abstract of the articles for repeopling and inhabiting of the province of Munster in Ireland," *CSPI*, III, 84-86.
- <sup>37</sup> Theodore W. Allen, *The Invention of the White Race: Racial Suppression and Social Control*, vol. I (New York: Verso, 1994), 59.
- <sup>38</sup> "Andrew Trollope, an English lawyer, to Walsingham, relating his ideas concerning Ireland. From Dublin, 12 September 1581," in *State Papers concerning the Irish Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth*, edited by William Maziere Brady (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1868), 50.
- <sup>39</sup> Allen, *passim*.
- <sup>40</sup> *The Act of Supremacy* (1560) and *The Act of Uniformity* (1560) in *IHD*, 121-125; Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, 225-230.
- <sup>41</sup> 19 July 1566 *CSPI*, I, 310.
- <sup>42</sup> 22 February 1579 *CSPI*, II, 161.
- <sup>43</sup> June 1588 *CSPI*, III, 533.
- <sup>44</sup> 25 September 1586, *CSPI*, III, 155.
- <sup>45</sup> 18 October 1586, *CSPI*, III, 180.
- <sup>46</sup> June 1588, *CSPI*, III, 532.
- <sup>47</sup> 19 October 1587, *CSPI*, III, 427.
- <sup>48</sup> *Cal. Carew MSS.*, III, 111 in *IHCS*, 175.
- <sup>49</sup> The Earl of Tyrone and O'Donnell to the King of Spain, 5 October 1595 in *IHCS*, 187.
- <sup>50</sup> *Cal. Carew MSS.*, III, 521 in *IHCS*, 181.
- <sup>51</sup> *Articles intended to be stood upon by Tyrone* in *IHD*, 119.
- <sup>52</sup> 10 December 1588, *CSPI*, VII, 401.
- <sup>53</sup> 11 December 1599, *CSPI*, VIII, 314.
- <sup>54</sup> Fynes Moryson, *Itinerary* (1617), II, iii, 278-81 in *IHCS*, 197.
- <sup>55</sup> *Articles intended to be stood upon by Tyrone* in *IHD*, 119-120.
- <sup>56</sup> Bucholz and Key, 149.
- <sup>57</sup> 31 January 1601, *CSPI* X, 169, 334, 356.
- <sup>58</sup> Edmund Spenser, *A Briefe Note on Ireland*, in *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition* X, ed. By Edwin Greenlaw, et. al. (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1949), 241, 244.
- <sup>59</sup> 30 September 1605, *CSPI: James I*, I, 322.
- <sup>60</sup> R. F. Foster, *The Oxford Illustrated History of Ireland*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Foster, *Modern Ireland*, chapter 3.
- <sup>61</sup> 12 September 1607, *CSPI: James I*, II, 273-274.
- <sup>62</sup> Raymond Gillespie, "The Early Modern Economy, 1600-1780" in *Ulster Since 1600: Politics, Economy, and Society*, eds. Liam Kennedy & Philip Ollerenshaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 13.
- <sup>63</sup> "The Speech used by Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, to Sir William Jones, upon his calling to be Lord Chief Justice of Ireland," in *IHCS*, 274.
- <sup>64</sup> Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 187-205.
- <sup>65</sup> *The Scheme of Plantation* in *IHCS*, 281-283.
- <sup>66</sup> *Pynnar's Survey of Ulster* (1619) in *IHCS*, 296.

- 
- <sup>67</sup> Thomas Bartlett, "Politics and Society, 1600-1800" in *Ulster since 1600*, 28.
- <sup>68</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 207.
- <sup>69</sup> Liam Kennedy, Kerby A. Miller, and Brian Gurrin, "People and Population Change, 1600-1914" in *Ulster since 1600*, 69-70.
- <sup>70</sup> Bartlett, "Politics and Society" in *Ulster since 1600*, 31-32.
- <sup>71</sup> 4 November 1641, *Calendar State Papers, Domestic (CSPD): Charles I, 1641*.
- <sup>72</sup> 11 November 1641, *CSPD: Charles I, 1641*.
- <sup>73</sup> Foster, *Modern Ireland*, 101.
- <sup>74</sup> Oliver Cromwell, "The Capture of Drogheda" in *Selected Documents in Irish History*, ed. Josef L. Altholz (M.E. Sharpe, 2000), 45-47.
- <sup>75</sup> *An Act for the Settlement of Ireland* (August 12, 1652) in *Scobell*, ii, 197.
- <sup>76</sup> Vincent Gookin, *The great case of transplantation in Ireland discussed* (1655), 21.
- <sup>77</sup> Richard Lawrence, *The interest of England in the Irish Transplantation, stated*, (1655), 12.
- <sup>78</sup> Allen, *The Invention of the White Race*, 51.
- <sup>79</sup> *The Declaratory Act of 1689* in *IHD*, 169.
- <sup>80</sup> Martin Wallace, *A Short History of Ireland* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1986), 58.
- <sup>81</sup> Jennifer Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual: The Orange Order and Orange Parades in Northern Ireland" (PhD diss., Oklahoma State University, 2004), 3; Michael Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State* (London: Pluto Press, 1980), *passim*.
- <sup>82</sup> Neil Jarman, *Displaying Faith: Orange, Green, and Trade Union Banners in Northern Ireland* (Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies: The Queen's University of Belfast, 1999), 25.
- <sup>83</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 67; Roseanne Cecil, "The Marching Season in Northern Ireland: An Expression of Politico-Religious Identity," in *Inside European Identities*, ed. Sharon MacDonald (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 146-166.
- <sup>84</sup> David A. Roberts, "The Orange Order in Ireland: A Religious Institution?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 22 (1971), 269-282.
- <sup>85</sup> *Ibid*, 271.
- <sup>86</sup> Nancy J. Curtin, "The Transformation of the Society of United Irishmen into a Mass-Based Revolutionary Organization," *Irish Historical Studies* 24 (1985), 463-492.
- <sup>87</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>88</sup> Brendan Mac Suibhne, "The Volunteers and Irish Identity in Northwest Ulster, 1778-1786," (PhD diss., Carnegie Mellon University, 1999), *passim*.
- <sup>89</sup> Josef L. Altholz, *Selected Documents in Irish History* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2000), 95.
- <sup>90</sup> *Ibid*, 103.
- <sup>91</sup> John Darby, *Scorpions in a Bottle: Conflicting Cultures in Northern Ireland* (London: Minority Rights Publications, 1997), *passim*.
- <sup>92</sup> Tim Sullivan, "Irish Home Rule and Resistance, 1912-1916," (Research Paper, Loyola University, 2003).
- <sup>93</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 5; See also Darby, *Scorpions in Battle*, *passim*.
- <sup>94</sup> Altholz, 111.
- <sup>95</sup> *Government of Ireland Act, 1920*, 10 & 11 GRO. 5. CH. 67.
- <sup>96</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 5; See also Darby, *Scorpions in Battle*, *passim*.
- <sup>97</sup> Darby, *Scorpions in Battle*, 26-27.
- <sup>98</sup> Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State*, 9.
- <sup>99</sup> Tim Pat Coogan, *The Troubles* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 77.
- <sup>100</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," *passim*.

- 
- <sup>101</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 11; See also Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State*.
- <sup>102</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 11.
- <sup>103</sup> Bobby Sands, *The Diary of Bobby Sands*, Sunday, 1 March 1981.
- <sup>104</sup> "The Hunger Strike of 1981 – Summary," *Conflict Archive on the Internet*, accessed 2015, <https://cain.ulster.ac.uk/events/hstrike/summary.htm>.
- <sup>105</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>106</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," *passim*.
- <sup>107</sup> "Northern Ireland: Guide to the Conflict and Peacebuilding in Northern Ireland," *Insight on Conflict*, accessed 2015, <https://www.insightonconflict.org>
- <sup>108</sup> *Government of Ireland Act, 1920*, 10 & 11 GRO. 5. CH. 67
- <sup>109</sup> Edwards, "Construction and Maintenance of Power Through Ritual," 11; See also Farrell, *Northern Ireland: The Orange State*.
- <sup>110</sup> John Coakley, "National Identity in Northern Ireland: Stability or Change?" *Nations and Nationalism* 13 (2007), 573-597.
- <sup>111</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>112</sup> Katy Hayward and Cathal McManus "Neither/Nor: The Rejection of Unionist and Nationalist Identities in Post Agreement Northern Ireland," *Capital and Class* 43 (2019), 139-155.